

Department of the Navy
SPS Performance Support Forum

Crystal Plaza 5, Conference Room B, 4th Floor

Crystal City, VA

July 21, 1999, 1:30 p.m. 5:00 p.m.

EDA Status Update

- 1) Debbie Streufert said she wanted to bring to everyone's attention the EDA tool to publish documents. She reported a lot of progress in testing with DFAS. However, there is not significant Navy participation in EDA. Use of EDA was supposed to be mandatory by June 1, 1999. She pointed out that EDA can be used by SPS sites as well as other systems. Currently, only about 30% of Navy sites are in compliance. The low metrics will be discussed with the O2s during the upcoming August 9th meeting. They will be told that sites need to start sending files using the EDA process.
- 2) She wants to raise people's attention that EDA is a viable tool to use with or without SPS. It can be used with electronic documents or scanned documents.
- 3) Jan Gosnell said there were a number of issues with EDA – the EDA server lacked documentation.
- 4) Mary Jo remarked that within the next year a lot of people will be using SPS 100%. A lot of people will be using SPS 50%. The Navy will need to accommodate both groups if it is going to achieve its paperless goals.
- 5) Debbie Streufert's response to the claimants' concerns over EDA was that the purpose of her attending this meeting was not to try to solve EDA issues. She further remarked that part of the problem is that DFAS has been unreasonable in its requirements due to the limitation of its computer systems.
- 6) Debbie commented on where they were in developing a major weapons system automation tool. They had completed testing of AMAS and given Elliott Branch a thumbnail. It looks favorable depending on the aspects looked at. The PR portion is almost ready for BETA testing.
- 7) Version 5.0 is available via the web. It is being reviewed by NSTL. If a claimant wants to know how to access the web version, they should contact Debbie Streufert. Claimants remarked that the EDA website worked infrequently.

- 8) Mary Jo stressed the importance of EDA by pointing out that 6 of 11 metrics are affected by EDA. **Mary Jo wants the 6 metrics area reflected in the minutes.**

4.1b Testing Update

- 1) Jan Gosnell discussed status of 4.1b testing. Acceptance testing has been going on for two weeks. Testers include Jan Gosnell, Jack Grove, Marty Richards, Jennifer Schultz, and George Peterson. Additional testers are required for next week. Debbie O'Rourke said NAVFAC would provide a tester. Zea Shultz said BUMED would provide one as well. An invitation was extended to the Marines to provide a tester.
- 2) The acceptance testing for deliverables includes 12 items. So far 4.1b is looking good. All issues are checking out fine. No show stoppers. Separating the "save" and "clause" routines worked the way it was supposed to. One problem is saving the DD350. There is an intermittent problem with the save routine – the data is occasionally lost. Linda Carroll (AMS) is aware of the problem, but to date, cannot find the source of the problem. They have put tracers on eight machines, but the problem has not happened since.

1057s

- 3) There is a problem with the 1057. Initially, Jan said the 1057 was not part of the 4.1b Delivery Order. Debbie O'Rourke remarked that the 1057 change to edits should be part of the Delivery Order. Jan checked and stated that both the 1057 and DD350 change to edits were in fact part of the Delivery Order.
- 4) It was reported that AMS has a script to fix the 1057 problem. Zea Shultz reported that AMS said it would take 3-5 weeks to fix the 1057 problems. Mary Jo suggested that the 1057 script will need to be tested because of the intermittent nature of the problems being encountered.
- 5) Next week is regression testing. There were 21 items that were SDRs that were fixed and they want to verify that they were, in fact, fixed.
- 6) John Forbes asked for a clarification of what the regression testing entailed. He was told that the testing was checking that the new fixes did not conflict with or corrupt any of the old fixes.

Security Model

- 7) Debbie O'Rourke reported that during the North Div. Install they could not get the security model script to work. NAVFAC had to develop major workarounds to get the security model to work. The new AMS representatives on the Help Desk were no help.
- 8) Debbie O'Rourke volunteered the services of Craig Furuta to help Jan Gosnell next week with the security model script work arounds. He is familiar with all the "hiccups" encountered by NAVFAC.

Scripts

- 9) CMO took for action to make sure all PSF representatives are on the list for scripts. Mary Jo noted she make sure that distribution of scripts would be brought up at the next CIMB. CMO suggested that AMS take for action to provide each PSF claimant representative with copies of the scripts. Jan Gosnell cautioned that if scripts are sent to all sites, some will download it when they do not need to. Debbie O'Rourke pointed out the solution was to send the scripts to the claimants, and let the claimants send to their sites that need them. Diana Stabile remarked that NAVAIR wanted the scripts.
- 10) Jan Gosnell recommended that detailed instructions be included with releases of scripts.

MILSTRIP Searches

- 11) Jan Gosnell reported that NAVSUP has a new Power Builder utility script that allows users to search by MILSTRIP, and that NAVSUP has added 5 more items to the script.

Upgrade Issues

- 12) Jan Gosnell stated that they have not been able to get a workable database to test if a site can upgrade from 3.5 to 4.1b or from 4.0 to 4.1b. Debbie O'Rourke offered PWC Jax's database. Jan said that on Monday, they will start to test if the data will convert from 3.5 to 4.1b and from 4.0 to 4.1b.
- 13) Jan said that there is no documentation on the 4.1b upgrade. It is not a requirement in the Delivery Order, so they are going to sit down and write it so that it is in the 4.1c delivery order.

SF 30

- 14) Debbie O'Rourke mentioned a problem with the SF 30 in 4.1a. The Block 16 was left blank. This problem has been fixed in 4.1b.
- 15) Debbie O'Rourke remarked that there were 3 or 4 Help Desk issues in the Minutes from the last RPSG meeting at the Washington Navy Yard that should be given to Jan Gosnell for 4.1b testing. Mary Jo took for action to pull from the Minutes and give to Jan.

CBT

- 1) The CBT CD-Rom costs \$125.
- 2) Dale Taylor remarked that NAVAIR had a single server with 1400 licenses on it, and was told by AMS that the cost of the CD-Rom was linked to server size and that it would cost NAVAIR \$42,000 to purchase a CD-Rom.
- 3) Mary Jo clarified that a claimant cannot put the CD-Rom on the server. Each command should buy one CD-Rom and use a projector. Dale remarked that NAVAIR did not want the CBT CD-Rom for the server anyway.

- 4) Charlene Sinkfield remarked that she did not have any problems with AMS on purchasing the CBT CD-Rom. She dealt with Richard Friznee at AMS. Just put the CD-Rom on one computer and use a projector to conduct training.
- 5) Debbie O'Rourke remarked that NAVFAC had four sites with the CD-Rom and loved it.

Requirements Issues

- 1) Mary Jo Johnson handed out the General Malishenko Brief. It shows what is supposed to be in the different versions, that is, the requirements by proposed release version. Representatives from the Requirements Board had been invited, but did not show up.
- 2) The Air Force has not accepted 4.1a, and will test 4.1b in October. One of the issues was security. The Air Force was not happy with the security. In general terms, 4.1a was not quite what the Air Force wanted. Furthermore, the Army has acknowledged problems with SPS similar to those identified and experienced by the Navy.
- 3) Debbie O'Rourke remarked why should the Air Force be different than the Navy. For example, NAVFAC had better functionality with FOCUS, but was told it had to go to SPS.
- 4) Debbie O'Rourke asked if the fact that the Air Force has refused acceptance of 4.1a will it equate to more AMS resources for the Navy in the first quarter of FY00. Mary Jo said the Air Force still wants to train many of its people so it will probably not translate into significantly more training resources for the Navy.
- 5) Jan Gosnell recommended 5 new requirements to recommend to the Requirements board. These were passed out and the PSF members present unanimously recommended forwarding them to the Requirements board.

ver 3.5 issues

- 6) Mary Jo inquired about any 3.5 sites not being upgraded by end of FY99. All claimants present reported that all their 3.5 sites will have upgraded to 4.1a by the end of FY99. Mary Jo said she needed to check with NAVSEA on this issue.
- 7) Reason Mary Jo inquired about status of 3.5 sites is that AMS Help Desk support for version 3.5 will be shut off at some as yet to be determined date in FY00.

PC-IPT Report and Navy Progress

- 8) Mary Jo Johnson handed out the PC-IPT (Paperless Contracting – Integrated Progress Team) report to the claimant representatives. She explained that the report shows what the Navy is moving toward and trying to do.
- 9) Mary Jo thanked all the claimants for helping the Navy have a firm 4.1a FY99 plan. Consequently, the majority of post / camp / station activities will be installed by the end of FY99, and trained by the end of calendar year 99.

- 10) The CMO expects that sites receiving 4.1 intend to train and operate with it.

Installations

- 11) Darren Free (AMS) stated that he did not think AMS capacity would be the limiting factor for the first quarter of FY00. However, Debbie O'Rourke disagreed. Darren Free conceded that the first two or three weeks in October were tight, but that November and December were fairly open.

Training

- 12) Mary Jo stated that it was the Navy's intention to augment AMS's training staff with its own instructors under the "train the trainers" program. Darren Free replied that conceptually where there was a training gap he did not have a problem with the Navy helping fill the gap with these individuals. He also said that he was actively working on the staffing issue to bolster AMS's Navy Customer Support Team. His philosophy was to not staff the team with "B" or "C" individuals just for expediency sake, but to hire quality individuals for the long term even if it meant being short-handed during the interim.

Operational Requirement

- 13) Mary Jo stated the need for sites to commit to operational use by the end of the calendar year. The CMO is not trying to force SPS on sites that need additional functionality.

IDIQ

- 14) Edna Gigon from NSWC Indian Head provided a one page brief to be included in the minutes on a SPS Requirements Problem, specifically with IDIQ (Delivery Order type contracts). This problem was discussed at last week's Regional PSG meeting at the Washington Navy Yard. The problem deals with Section B: Unit of Order for basic Contract is 1 Lot. Under SPS you can only issue 1 delivery order if you put in "1 Lot" under Section B. The Version 3.5.c work around is to enter "1000 units/ea" so that you can write numerous delivery orders against the basic contract. Edna cautions to make sure your Section B under the delivery order says "1 Lot".

Metrics for CIMB

- 1) Mary Jo Johnson emphasized the importance of accurate data for the PC-IPT Report. She explained the reason for the changes in the Metrics Brief – to enable Admiral Jenkins to understand where the sites/claimants are with SPS.
- 2) Mary Jo stated that the unassigned licenses need to be assigned.
- 3) Zea Shultz reported that BUMED does not plan on training its satellite sites since they will only be doing PRs, and BUMED will use in-house training/OJT to teach these PR users the limited aspects of SPS they need to know.

- 4) Mary Jo mentioned that NAVSEA had unassigned licenses, and mentioned the great many unassigned licenses at China Lake. Diana Stabile reported that there are still a large number of Macintosh users at China Lake who will need licenses once they are upgraded with appropriate computers.
- 5) Barbara Cordle stated the Marines could use 20 more licenses.
- 6) Mary Jo Johnson said the new CIMB Metrics Brief Presentation Format was not yet ready to be distributed, and would rework them on Monday afternoon after getting claimant input. Mary Jo wants to identify more issues such as those sites not having requisite technical infrastructure and hence not knowing when they would be ready for deployment.
- 7) Several claimants expressed reluctance to put low productivity on paper. Barbara Cordle mentioned USMC site 8t^h & I which was 100% paperless and which could only turn out 2 PRs per day. Barbara Cordle is reluctant to publish low productivity numbers without some clarification as to the various reasons/extenuating circumstances.
- 8) Darren Free stated he is concerned that the productivity measures might be presented in the wrong way. Some of the problems are tied to the product, but some are tied to users not being familiar with Windows or computers or other unrelated issues.
- 9) Gene Toni remarked that the low productivity numbers are already out there and known. He mentioned FISC Puget Sound.
- 10) Zea Shultz wanted a standard for actions to be promulgated to claimants so they all report the same productivity data and inquired about the possibility of a script for PALT. Mary Jo said that claimants should continue to report their own PALTS. That way each claimants' productivity numbers will be meaningful.
- 11) Mary Jo commented that the CMO would review the results of these metrics before deciding whether they will be permanent requirements.

FY00 Planning Process

- 1) Mary Jo briefly mentioned the FY00 Planning Process.

Problems and Installation Issues

- 1) Mary Jo mentioned that Dan Lindner (PMO) and Darren Free (AMS) were attending to hear claimants' problems regarding installation issues.

AMS Tech Reps

- 2) Charlene Sinkfield related that the AMS representative sent to upgrade COMMSC was not as knowledgeable as he could have been. The person needs to be more adept at troubleshooting problems that come up. Also there was an AMS intern who did not add value to the process

and Charlene was wondering who paid for the intern. Darren Free replied that it is a fixed price contract so essentially AMS absorbs the cost of the intern, or at least, the site does not pay extra. Charlene reiterated the need for the AMS person to be able to troubleshoot problems as they arise and not just those that happen to be already documented.

COGNOS/System Conflicts

- 3) Charlene also stated that MSC did not realize that its financial version of COGNOS would be incompatible with the SPS version of COGNOS. If additional versions of COGNOS can cause problems this needs to be made known to the other claimants.

Site Tech Reps

- 4) Jan Gosnell made the statement that many site's technical reps are totally hands off and completely trusting of the AMS reps during the upgrade process, and they should be more involved. Debbie O'Rourke disagreed with this statement and said NAVFAC's technical persons are participating in the upgrade process, and have been told to be present. Zea Shultz added that their site technical persons have been instructed to be there, and that BUMED has also hired a PwC technical rep to be present at each upgrade.

Documentation

- 5) Charlene Sinkfield asked that AMS document all the issues that occurred at a particular site during the install or upgrade. That way, the AMS reps, who come to the site for the next upgrade, can read the documentation and be familiar with prior issues at the site. This is important because it is not always the same AMS rep that performs successive upgrades at a site. Dan Lindner remarked that this information is included in the Install Report, but evidently the AMS reps have not been reading the reports before visiting a site. AMS reps need to read the last Install report at a site before visiting that site for an upgrade.
- 6) Darren Free summarized what he saw as three issues raised:
 - a. AMS tech team was not sufficiently experienced at MSC's upgrade.
 - b. The Installation Package – software incompatibilities need to be documented.
 - c. The Post-Install Documentation – Problems need to be documented and read before the next visit to that site.

Craig Furuta added that AMS needs to have this knowledge transferred to the Help Desk so if an AMS install team develops a solution/workaround at one site, the AMS Help Desk can apply it to other sites encountering similar problems.

- 7) Darren Free reiterated his commitment to hire quality people. These people may not know everything (especially starting out), but he will expect them to have the maturity and common sense to call the ASM Help Desk to get the answer. There is AMS support on the back end of things to help the AMS front line installers.

MOS Testing

- 8) Zea Shultz mentioned that BUMED people felt pressured by AMS reps when doing the measures of success. The AMS reps just hung around looking at the BUMED reps while they were doing the MOS, which made the BUMED reps feel pressured to hurry up.

Security Model Support

- 9) Debbie O'Rourke mentioned that the security model was not working properly on new installs. The AMS Help Desk, when contacted, replied that the two AMS individuals who wrote it no longer worked there and no one knew how to fix it.
- 10) The security model script is supposed to be fixed in 4.1b. Craig Furuta will be testing this next week. Mike Goss (AMS) is working on building an uploader package for the security model for new installs.
- 11) Mary Jo expressed concern that other non-NAVFAC new installs receive the fix. She specifically mentioned the three Independent sites recently installed, and the need for them to be retrofitted with whatever solution is developed. Jan Gosnell said the script has to have detailed instructions for the Independents.

EDA

- 12) Gene Toni mentioned that the EDA product currently delivers a postscript file (which is what AMS was contractually required to provide). However, this does no good in helping sites go paperless. A PDF is needed to go paperless. Darren Free remarked that he has told his AMS team to think in broad terms (not just contractually). AMS is committed to helping the Navy meet its paperless acquisition goals, and not just meeting its own contractual requirements.
- 13) Gene Toni remarked that the user needed to start getting a payback. Currently, EDA is just another obstacle to the user in achieving productivity. EDA is a real show stopper. There is a need for hard numbers on productivity loss in order to focus on product problems. The data can help identify critical items. EDA has been labeled as a "nice to have", but it really affects productivity so it is more important than simply a "nice to have".
- 14) Debbie O'Rourke added that EDA requires a lot of manual intervention.
- 15) Mary Jo pointed out that 6 of 11 metrics on the EA-21 progress report relate to EDA.
- 16) Mary Jo handed out an additional 5 requirements the CIMB has to approve. The PSF members present unanimously approved these requirements to be recommended to the requirements board. Darren Free remarked AMS cannot do anything on those items until the JRB and the PMO formally task AMS with spending resources to address the issues.
- 17) Daria Antonucci asked if AMS needs to visit the BUMED satellite sites. Dan Lindner remarked that AMS needs to visit sites for warranty reasons.

Mary Jo Adjourned the meeting at 1700

List of attachments sent in separate e-mail

1. Requirements Proposed Release Version
2. E-mail from Mary Jo Johnson 70-20-99 "Contribution to the PC-IPT Report
3. PC-IPT Report as of 7-20-1999
4. E-mail from Jan Gosnell dated 7-18-9 on "Issues that need Requirements Board Attention"
(Proposal for 5 New Requirements)
5. Copy of the PC-WIPT metrics brief highlighting the 6 areas of paperless measures.
6. Current copies of CMO/Claimant FY-99 Installation and Training Plans
7. MSC's installation Issues
8. NSWC Indian Head's brief on IDIQ